

REMARKS

FIGS. 1-3 and 5 have been amended to include the legend "PRIOR ART" as suggested by the examiner to satisfy the objection to the drawings on page 2, section 2 of the office action.

FIG. 5 has been amended to include the reference character "500" to satisfy the objection to the drawings on page 2, section 3 of the office action.

FIG. 7 has been amended to correct the hatch pattern in the net section 502 to conform to that shown in FIG. 5.

The specification has been amended to refer to the hatch pattern instead of levels of shading in FIG. 5 to satisfy the objection to the drawings on page 2, section 4 of the office action.

The specification has been amended to clarify that the resolution of the rounded coordinates is represented by the dot size as explained on page 10, lines 7-13 of the specification.

The specification has been amended to clarify the location of the translated vertices shown in FIGS. 7-9.

Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Support for the amendment to Claims 1 and 11 may be found in the specification on page 8, line 12 to page 9, line 1 and on page 10, lines 16-23.

Claims 3 and 13 have been amended to clarify the claimed subject matter described on page 9, lines 12-27 to overcome the objection to the drawings on page 2, section 5 of the office action.

Claims 9 and 16 have been amended to clarify the claimed subject matter described on page 11, lines 23-27.

Claims 10 and 20 have been amended to clarify the

claimed subject matter described on page 12, lines 10-23.

Claims 7 and 18 have been amended to clarify the claimed subject matter described on page 8, line 25 to page 9, line 1.

Claim 21 has been canceled.

New Claim 22 has been added to claim subject matter described on page 12, lines 10-23.

Claims 1-20 and 22 remain pending in the application.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and examination of Claims 1-20 and 22 in view of the amendments above and the arguments below.

By way of this response, Applicant has made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain any outstanding issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the examiner telephone Timothy R. Croll at (408)433-7625 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Response to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 11-13, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yang, U.S. Patent 5,731,986 (Yang). Applicant has amended the claims to overcome the rejection as follows.

Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to require that the resolution of the rounded coordinates be selected from a plurality of resolutions for rounding coordinates of the vertices according to a desired level of detail for a net failure density plot of the integrated circuit die as explained in the specification from page 8, line 12 to page 9, line 7.

As explained in the abstract, *Yang* downsizes and rounds coordinates to reduce the feature size of a mask pattern for an integrated circuit. In contrast to Claim 1, *Yang* does not disclose selecting a resolution from a plurality of resolutions according to the desired level of detail for a net failure density plot of the integrated circuit die. Because *Yang* does not disclose selecting a resolution from a plurality of resolutions for the rounded coordinates according to the desired level of detail for a net failure density plot as recited in Claim 1, *Yang* does not anticipate Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claims 1 and 11 have been further amended to require calculating rounded coordinates having the selected resolution to fill in each of the plurality of nets between the vertices as explained in the specification on page 10, lines 16-23 and illustrated in FIG. 9.

In column 5, lines 33 *et seq.* and shown in FIG. 5B cited by the rejection on page 5, *Yang* does not disclose calculating rounded coordinates having the selected resolution to fill in each of the plurality of nets between the vertices as recited in Claim 1 and shown in FIG. 9.

Because *Yang* does not disclose calculating rounded coordinates having the selected resolution to fill in each of the plurality of nets between the vertices as recited in Claim 1, *Yang* does not anticipate Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claims 1 and 11 have been further amended to require generating as output the rounded coordinates of the vertices and the rounded coordinates between the vertices to represent each of the plurality of nets as explained in the specification on page 10, line 20 to page 11, line 6.

Yang does not disclose generating as output the rounded coordinates of the vertices and the rounded

coordinates between the vertices to represent each of the plurality of nets as recited in Claim 1. Because Yang does not disclose generating as output the rounded coordinates of the vertices and the rounded coordinates between the vertices to represent each of the plurality of nets as recited in Claim 1, Yang does not anticipate Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

The rejection of dependent Claims 2, 3, 12, and 13 is likewise overcome by the amendment of independent Claims 1 and 11 explained above.

Response to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang as applied in the rejection of Claims 2 and 12 and further in view of Tau, et al., U.S. Patent 5,751,581 (Tau). The rejection of dependent Claims 4 and 14 is overcome by the amendment of independent Claims 1 and 11 explained above.

Further, Tau does not disclose the die identification or the layer identification recited in Claims 4 and 14 in columns 3-4, paragraph 11 cited by the rejection.

Claims 5-10 and 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang as applied in the rejection of Claims 1, 2, 11, and 12 and further in view of Noble, U.S. Patent 5,392,222 (Noble). The rejection of dependent Claims 5-10 and 15-20 is overcome by the amendment of independent Claims 1 and 11 explained above.

Further, as explained in the abstract, Noble is directed to positioning a field of view relative to an integrated circuit die for placing a test probe. In column 9, line 18 to column 10, line 58 or in column 4, lines 45-68 cited by the rejection, Noble does not teach or suggest the claimed rounded coordinates, nor does Noble teach or suggest

Amendment "A" page 12 of 12
10/658,017

DOCKET NO. 03-0599
81582(6653)

the claimed associating a rounded coordinate that occurs more than a selected number of times in a plurality of failed nets with a location of a defect in the integrated circuit die as recited in Claim 5. In fact, *Noble* makes no mention of the claimed rounded coordinates and makes no mention of associating a rounded coordinate that occurs more than a selected number of times in a plurality of failed nets with a location of a defect in the integrated circuit die as alleged by the rejection.

Further, the allegation cited on page 9 and 10 of the rejection that *Noble* locates the best field of view position for the most efficient repair of a defect does not appear to read on the subject matter of the rejected claims.

No additional fee is believed due for this amendment.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric James Whitesell

Reg. No. 38,657

encl:

replacement sheets for FIGS. 1-3, 5, and 7

Address all correspondence to:

LSI Logic Corporation
1551 McCarthy Blvd., MS: D-106
Milpitas, CA 95035

Direct telephone inquiries to:

Timothy R. Croll
(408) 433-7625